



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/926,436	01/18/2002	Steven Spicer	T8466295US	4258

26912 7590 12/13/2007  
GOWLING LAFLEUR HENDERSON LLP  
SUITE 1600, 1 FIRST CANADIAN PLACE  
100 KING STREET WEST  
TORONTO, ON M5X 1G5  
CANADA

EXAMINER
----------

GEREZGIHER, YEMANE M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2144

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

12/13/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/926,436	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SPICER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Yemane M. Gerezgiher	<b>Art Unit</b> 2144	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 September 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 10-14 and 16-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 10-14 and 16-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. Response filed on 09/17/2007 has been entered and made of record.

Claims 1-8, 10-14 and 16-19 remain pending in this application.

### ***Double Patenting***

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-8, 10-14 and 16-19 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 9-12, 14-22, and 24-30 of copending Application No. 11303015. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably

distinct from each other because the only difference is elimination or omission of the undesired limitation, which would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to omit such undesired feature since it has been held that omission of an element and its function in a combination where the remaining elements perform the same functions as before involving only routine skill in the art. *In re Karlson*, 136 USPQ 184. The claimed limitations are a subset of the already claimed invention in the copending application.

**This instant application**

Claim 1. A secure network resource access system for facilitating network access by network terminals to network printer located behind an enterprise firewall, the secure network resource access system comprising:

a proxy server located logically outside a firewall for receiving printing data from a data source located outside the firewall, the proxy server having a queue for storing the received data, the printing data being associated with the network printer; and

a polling server located logically behind the firewall, the polling server being configured for polling the proxy server to pull the received printing data across the firewall from the queue of the proxy server to the polling server

**Copending application 11303015**

Claim 1: A print control system for facilitating communication of a data package via a polling server between a network terminal and a network printing device over a network, the data package configured for authorized data processing by the network printing device, the print control system comprising:

a resource registry including resource records associated with the network printing device, the resource records defining at least a user access level for each said network printing device;

a polling server configured for obtaining the data package from a proxy server across a firewall in response to a poll request to the proxy server, the data package including print data for processing by the network printing device,

...

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-8, 10-14 and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grantges (U.S. Patent Number 6,324,648) in view of Remer et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,742,039) hereinafter "Remer".

As per claim 1, a proxy server located logically outside a firewall from a data source located outside the firewall, the proxy server having a queue for storing the received data, the printing data being associated with the network printer; [See abstract, Figure 1, Column 5 Lines 58-67: Grantges disclosed a proxy server logically located outside a firewall of an enterprise network] and a polling server located logically behind the firewall, the polling server being configured for polling the proxy server to pull the received printing data across the firewall from the queue of the proxy server to the polling server. [See Figure 1: Grantges disclosed an application gateway having therein a proxy server for receiving request messages originated from a client terminal in a public

network and an enterprise server logically located behind the firewall of the enterprise network].

Grantges substantially disclosed the invention as claimed. However, Grantges failed to teach a polling device located logically behind a firewall, the polling device being configured for polling a proxy server to determine a status of a queue and to pull any received transmitted data across the firewall from the queue of the proxy server to the polling server.

However, as evidenced by the teachings of Remer, a polling server located logically behind the firewall, the polling server being configured for polling the proxy server to determine a status of a queue and to pull any received data across the firewall from the queue of the proxy was known in the art at the time the invention was made (see Remer, Abstract, Column 4, Lines 35-50, Column 5, Lines 16-23, Lines 37-45 and Column 6, Lines 32-54). Thus, it is respectfully submitted that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the teachings of Remer related to a polling server located logically behind a firewall, determining the queue status of the proxy device outside the firewall and polling the proxy device across the firewall and have modified the teachings of Grantges related to access control of network resources in order to better facilitate security and in order to enhance security across enterprise network resources by avoiding

high cost and high risk security approach (Remer, Column 1, Line 61 through Column 2, Line 40).

As per claim 3, this claim has substantially the same scope functional limitations as recited in claim 1 above, and it is rejected with the same rationale.

As per claims 2 and 4, Grantges disclosed "alias" (URL) identifying the application server resource and further the application including "alias" (additional identifier of a specific function such as "/billing" implying an application involving billing information and where the "polling server" (application gateway having therein a proxy server for polling request messages) and directing the received application request to the appropriate resource accordingly. See Column 7 Lines 1-8, Column 10 and Lines 32-54).

As per claim 5, Grantges disclosed a step of directing the received data to the network resource in accordance with the associated alias name. [See Fig. 1: Grantges disclosed an application gateway having therein a proxy server for polling request messages originated from a client terminal in a public network and an enterprise server logically located behind the firewall of the enterprise network directing the request data to the appropriate network resource].

As per claims 6 and 12, Grantges disclosed an enterprise server for obtaining the received data from the polling server and for distributing the

received data to the network resource [Fig.1, an application gateway distributing the requested network resource applications].

As per claims 7 and 13, wherein the alias name uniquely identifies a physical network location of the network resource and is associated with a physical property of the network resource. [These claims have similar limitation as the already rejected claim 2 above and are rejected with the same rationale. Furthermore, Grantges disclosed a URL (alias name), which is usually interchangeable or associated with an IP address that is statically or permanently assigned to a server (network resource), where the network resource is physically located some where on the network. See Column 7 Lines 1-8, Column 10 and Lines 32-54].

As per claims 8 and 14, wherein the data source is a network terminal configured for communication with the network resource. [See Fig. 1, network terminal having therein a web browser configured to communicate with the network resource in the network].

As per claims 10 and 16, Remer disclosed printing data being selected from the group comprising: text; image; and multimedia data [Remer, Column 3, Lines 2-13, printers, which are configured to print documents of multiple formats].



As per claims 11 and 17, Remer disclosed that the received printing data was in a format suitable for processing by the network printer [Remer, Column 3, Lines 2-13].

As per claim 18, wherein the system facilitates access to a plurality of network resources [See Fig. 1, Grantges disclosed providing an access to plurality of resources (App.1, App.2, App.3 and so forth) with in the secured enterprise network].

As per claim 19, wherein the method facilitates secure access to a plurality of network resources. [See Col.3, Lines 7-16, Col. 4, Lines 23-32 and Fig. 1, Grantges disclosed a secured access using SSL ("HTTPS") referenced by #'s 54, 58, 60 and 62].

### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection, which better address the claimed invention as amended.

### ***Conclusion***

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.**

See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yemane M. Gerezgiher whose telephone number is (571) 272-3927. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM - 6:00 PM Mon - Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William C. Vaughn can be reached on (571) 272-3922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Yemane. M. Gerezgiher  
Patent Examiner  
AU: 2144, TC: 2100

  
WILLIAM VAUGHN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100